



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,988	03/15/2004	Jurgen Stauder	PF030050	1404
24498 7590 06/29/2007 JOSEPH J. LAKS, VICE PRESIDENT THOMSON LICENSING LLC PATENT OPERATIONS PO BOX 5312 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312			EXAMINER REDDING, THOMAS M	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/800,988	Applicant(s) STAUDER ET AL.	
	Examiner Thomas M. Redding	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☒ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/15/2004, 8/18/2004</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION (Quayle)

1. This application is in condition for allowance except for the formal matters addressed herein below.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm'r Pat. 1935).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The section of the specification labeled "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" is over 12 pages long. The "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS" section is less than 3 pages long. The MPEP describes the summary as a "Brief" Summary of Invention.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

The summary provided is neither brief nor concise.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION: See MPEP §608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately.

Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described, and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.

Much of what is presently in the summary should be in a detailed description. In short, the “summary” of the disclosure should summarize, not lay out the detailed description.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. The following quotations of 37 CFR § 1.75(a) is the basis of objection:

(a) The specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.

4. Claim is objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery. Claim 1 refers to “the candidate regions” without actually defining what “region” is referred to. It is unclear whether these are whole frames or subsets of individual frames. Clarification is required.

5. Claim 11 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claim 1, as well as claims 2-10 and 12-15 that depend therefrom, the prior art of record teaches the following.

The prior art of Cooper and Foote (“Scene Boundary Detection Via Video Self-Similarity Analysis”, by Matthew Cooper and Jonathan Foote, In Proceedings of the international Conference on Image Processing, October 2001), does describe a method for segmenting video to distinguish scene changes. The paper does not suggest further searching for slates or tokens, or automatically synchronizing audio and video.

The prior art of Myers et al. in US Patent publication 2002/0051575, “Method and Apparatus for Recognizing Text in an Image Sequence of Scene Imagery”, detects, locates, and tracks text regions within captured imagery. Myers also combines OCR results from multiple

Art Unit: 2624

frames taking the best result from each frame in a sequence to form a single result more accurate than the result from any one single frame. Myers also uses confidence scores to eliminate false text. Myers does not discuss detecting scene boundaries or automatically synchronizing audio and video.

Grass Valley, Inc. at present has posted on their web-site (http://www.grassvalley.com/docs/DataSheets/film/bones_dailies/FIL-1020D.pdf) a preliminary data sheet for a product named "Bones Dailies" that does auto stick/slate detection. This product does not do scene boundary detection or provide for reading text from the slate.

IRIDAS, also currently has posted on their web-site (<http://www.speedgrade.com/dds/>), a description of a product named "SpeedGrade DDS". This is described as having real-time scene detection and automatic slate detection. The document available does not indicate that information is read off the slate.

While many of the claimed features are individually disclosed by the prior art citations above, there is currently no suggestion to combine these teachings in a manner that would render the claimed invention obvious without reliance on improper hindsight.

7. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Conclusion

8. This application is in condition for allowance except for the formal matters addressed above.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm'r Pat. 1935).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M. Redding whose telephone number is (571) 270-1579. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 7:30 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian P. Werner can be reached on (571) 272-7401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/800,988

Page 7

Art Unit: 2624

/TMR/

/Brian P. Werner/

Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE), Art Unit 2624